

# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Viginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/082,715	02/25/2002	Francis M. Creighton	5236-000313	5857
75	. 590 08/20/2003			
Bryan K. Wheelock Harness, Dickey & Pierce, P.L.C. Suite 400			EXAMINER	
			DONOVAN, LINCOLN D	
7700 Bonhomme St. Louis, MO 63105			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
,			2832	
			DATE MAILED: 08/20/2003	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)	1				
Office Action Summary			CREIGHTON, FRANCIS M.	$U^{\iota}$				
		10/082,715						
		Examiner	Art Unit					
•	The MAILING DATE of this communication app	Lincoln Donovan						
Period fo			•					
THE - Exte after - If the - If NC - Failu - Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. Insions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. In period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply operiod for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period were to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing and patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a rep within the statutory minimum of thirty ( vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTH cause the application to become ABAI	ly be timely filed  30) days will be considered timely.  IS from the mailing date of this communication.  NDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).					
1)🛛	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 J	<u>lune 2003</u> .						
2a)⊠	This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) Thi	is action is non-final.						
3)	3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.							
Disposit	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>i</i> ion of Claims	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D.	11, 453 O.G. 213.					
4)⊠	Claim(s) <u>1,2,5,6 and 31-51</u> is/are pending in th	ne application.						
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.							
5)	Claim(s) is/are allowed.							
6)	☐ Claim(s) <u>1,2,5,6 and 31-51</u> is/are rejected.							
7)	Claim(s) is/are objected to.							
•	-Claim(s)are subject to restriction and/or	election requirement.						
	ion Papers							
•	The specification is objected to by the Examiner							
10)	The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accep	•						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).								
11) The proposed drawing correction filed on is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.								
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.  12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.								
,—	under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120							
	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign	priority under 35 U.S.C. &	119(a)-(d) or (f)					
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:								
-/1	1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.							
	2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No							
* 5	Copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International Bur See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the prior application for a list of the prior action for a list of the prio	ity documents have been re eau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	eceived in this National Stage					
14) 🗌 A	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic	priority under 35 U.S.C. §	119(e) (to a provisional application)	).				
	)  The translation of the foreign language pro- Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domesti	· ·						
Attachmen	t(s)		,					
2) Notic	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	5) 🔲 Notice of Info	mmary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) ormal Patent Application (PTO-152)					
S. Patent and T	rademark Office		· <del></del>					

Application/Control Number: 10/082,715

Art Unit: 2832

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 1-2, 5-6 and 31-51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Leupold [US 5,216,400].

Leupold discloses a permanent magnet [19] having varying magnetic directions in three dimensions at selected points [see figure 2] with multiple embodiments and magnetic fields. The specific magnetization directions and orientations of the magnet segments would have been an obvious design consideration based on the desired magnetic field to be produced.

3. Claims 9-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Leupold as applied to claims 1 and 5 above, and further in view of Golden et al. [US 5,622,169].

Golden et al. discloses a magnetic member used within the body of a patient.

Leupold discloses a permanent magnet providing multidimensional magnetic fields.

Application/Control Number: 10/082,715

Art Unit: 2832

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the permanent magnet of Leupold for the magnet of Golden et al. for the purpose of providing multidimensional control.

## Response to Arguments

- 4. Applicant's arguments filed 03-03-03 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
  Applicant argues:
- [1]: Leupold does not teach a magnet that is configured to optimize a magnetic field property, let-alone-in-a-selected-direction-at a-selected-point;
  - [2]: Leupold teaches the working magnetic field being within a cavity.

Examiner disagrees:

Regarding [1]: Leupold teaches the magnet being configured to optimize a magnetic field property, let alone in a selected direction at a selected point, see column 5, line 43-51.

Regarding [2]: Leupold teaches access ports, column 5, lines 55-57.

### Conclusion

5. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the

Art Unit: 2832

mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Examiner Lincoln Donovan whose telephone number is (703) 308-3111.

The fax number for this Group is (703)308-7724.

---- Any-inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application of proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703)308-0956.

LDD

August 17, 2003

